

RECEIVED

EIS000294

OCT 21 1999

11 MS. OLSEN: My name is Mary Olsen. I am with  
12 Nuclear Information and Resource Service. We're a  
13 national organization based in Washington, D.C.,  
14 and you will receive testimony from the home  
15 office next week. But I am the staffer for the  
16 first regional office, which is here in Georgia;  
17 and I provide testimony this afternoon for the  
18 regional office.

19 I am inspired by things I have heard today to  
20 1 start off by saying that the scope of this EIS is  
(continued  
21 on page 2 obviously not accurate, compared to the impacts  
22 that this project apparently will have. I've  
23 heard my colleagues who generate nuclear waste  
24 clearly state that if the repository program does  
25 not go forward, their reactors will close. And if

|

1  
(continued  
from  
page 1)

1 that is the case, then the continued operation of  
2 nuclear reactors has to be included in this  
3 environmental impact statement, and all the  
4 attendant risks and health impacts that go along  
5 with nuclear power generation. So clearly, if  
6 reactor closure is tied to Yucca Mountain, we have  
7 to put that squarely on the table and include that  
8 in this analysis.

9 I also want to note that the no-action  
10 alternative is not what is in this EIS. It's  
11 clearly stated in the law what the no-action  
12 alternative would be, and that is going back to  
13 Congress and allowing a full debate by the people  
14 of this country if the Yucca Mountain project is  
15 canceled. It is not "leave it on the site for  
16 10,000 years," and the Department of Energy is  
17 well outside its bounds to even suggest that.

18 Now, I'm angry. Why am I angry? Because we  
19 came forward a year ago saying the Department of  
20 Energy already has the data in your possession to  
21 show that this site not only could not meet the  
22 EPA standards in 1991, '92, whatever year you want  
23 to pick, for carbon-14 release. Okay. We went  
24 back to Congress and had a fight there. We lost.  
25 All right. We don't have an EPA standard that

2

3  
(continued  
on page 3)

1 cares about the global dose from carbon-14 at  
2 Yucca Mountain. But we do have site suitability  
3 guidelines, and you as the Department of Energy do  
4 have data that shows that Yucca Mountain  
5 currently, on the data we have today, violates the  
6 site suitability guidelines and, by law, should be  
7 disqualified. Two hundred and eighteen  
8 environmental organizations -- local, state,  
9 regional, national, international -- petitioned  
10 the Secretary of Energy to disqualify Yucca  
11 Mountain a year ago. We should not be having this  
12 EIS meeting today. We should not be considering  
13 an EIS on Yucca Mountain. We know it's going to  
14 leak; you've heard that testimony in various forms  
15 today. The fact is it's a failed site.

3  
(continued  
from page  
2)

16 So, as a failed site and since we are here  
17 today and we know the no-action alternative that's  
18 been put forward is ridiculous, I want to tell you  
19 something else that's ridiculous, and that's all  
20 the assumptions about containers. We have real-  
21 world data. We have about 70 dry casks that have  
22 been loaded in the field with no previous  
23 experiments to say how they would perform except  
24 for the reactor communities that are hosting them.  
25 I know that the materials would be different for

4  
(continued  
on page 4)

4  
(continued  
on page 5)

1 repository containers, but the vendors are likely  
2 to be the same, and the fabrication techniques are  
3 what we've had all along, which is welding and  
4 other forms of putting metals together.

5 We have, in the 65 or 70 casks that are in  
6 use today, already one juvenile failure. It's at  
7 Palisades reactor in Michigan. I used to live an  
8 hour and a half from it; I know it well. Tell me  
9 that there's only going to be one juvenile failure  
10 in a thousand years or even, as EPA now assumes,  
11 one at loading; and I will tell you that the  
12 Challenger blew up on statistics that were well  
13 known and well understood to not represent reality  
14 or previous experience. And we have previous  
15 experience with these containers, and you have to  
16 assume a 1- to 1.4-percent failure at loading,  
17 already in the ground, based on current  
18 experience. And that's not even counting the  
19 containers that have neutron dynamic problems in  
20 the neutron shields that have been evolving  
21 hydrogen gas when they're being loaded or any of  
22 the heavy-load issues.

23 So, as we fight about what we're going to do  
24 with this waste in the long term, I challenge DOE  
25 to come forward and assist the utilities who are

4 (continued  
from page 4)

1 currently facing competition, do not have the time  
2 and money to be adequately dealing with their own  
3 container problems; and come up with what we  
4 desperately need, which is an immediate way to  
5 deal with the waste that is piling up and do so  
6 responsibly in ways that are not going to involve  
7 hydrogen exposures, faulty welds and other things  
8 like that.

9 So let's just get it straight. The  
10 assumptions that are in this EIS are completely  
11 cooked, they're completely massaged. And even  
12 then, the doses that are pictured in this EIS  
13 exceed every possible radiation limit.

5

14 MR. LAWSON: Thirty seconds.

15 MS. OLSEN: So I'm going to end with the  
16 other reason that we shouldn't be in this room  
17 right now. And that's because, before that,

18 6 you've got to calculate the MOX fuel issue. The  
19 Nuclear Control Institute shows that a release of  
20 radiation of MOX fuel doubles latent cancer loads.  
21 Has that been included in this EIS? -- Here goes  
22 my alarm -- No.

23 So finally, the other reason that I'm really  
24 quite angry that I'm here at all is because we as  
25 7 (continued  
on page 6) a people in this country -- I am a citizen of the

7 (continued

1 from page 5)

United States -- have a treaty with the Western Shoshone people that says that we have safe transit across their land, and that's all it says. And Yucca Mountain isn't just their sacred land, it is their land, along with a whole lot of other land which the federal government has taken by appropriation only. So we as citizens have a responsibility to our citizenship as international people in recognizing that the Western Shoshone are not saying they're citizens of the United States; they're saying they're Western Shoshone people, and we're trespassing, DOE is trespassing.

So we have a responsibility again to look at what are we doing here and not just go along with this process. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Anna Vizrraga. Is she here? Unfortunately not. If she's not, Louis Zeller, to be followed by Janet Zeller.

6